parks, natural resource management agencies, educator preparation programs, museums, or other organizations with expertise in engaging young people with real world examples of environmental and scientific concepts. The legislation also establishes a pilot program for outdoor school education programs that offer intensive, hands-on learning experiences, such as residential programs and summer camps.

The No Child Left Inside Act will also help coordinate Federal efforts on environmental education. It requires the Secretary of Education to establish an environmental literacy advisory panel to coordinate and report on environmental literacy activities across Federal Agencies. It also will provide easy access to environmental education resources through the Department of Education's website.

The No Child Left Inside Act has the support of nearly 100 organizations, representing educators, parks, museums, environmental organizations, and community-based organizations at the national, State, and local levels. They stand ready and willing to partner with schools across the Nation. The Federal Government should be a partner too. That is why I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring and passing the No Child Left Inside Act.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. DAINES, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. RICKETTS, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 1244. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent double dipping between tax credits and grants or loans for clean vehicle manufacturers; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1244

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Ending Duplicative Subsidies for Electric Vehicles Act''

SEC. 2. COORDINATION OF ELECTRIC VEHICLE CREDITS WITH OTHER SUBSIDIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 30D(d)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by Public Law 117–169, is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Such term shall not include any person who has received a loan under section 136(d) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, a loan guarantee under section 1703 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 with respect to a project described in section 1703(b)(8) of such Act, or a grant under section 50143 of the Act titled 'An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of S. Con. Res. 14' for the taxable year in which the new clean vehicle is placed in service or any prior taxable year.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2022.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. LEE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 1247. A bill to amend the First Step Act of 2018 to permit defendants convicted of certain offenses to be eligible for reduced sentences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1247

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Terry Technical Correction Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that on June 14, 2021, the Supreme Court of the United States decided the case of Terry v. United States, 141 S. Ct. 1858 (2021), holding that crack offenders who did not trigger a mandatory minimum do not qualify for the retroactivity provisions of section 404 of the First Step Act of 2018 (21 U.S.C. 841 note).

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to clarify that the retroactivity provisions of section 404 of the First Step Act of 2018 (21 U.S.C. 841 note) are available to those offenders who were sentenced for a crack-cocaine offense before the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–220) became effective, including individuals with low-level crack offenses sentenced under section 401(b)(1)(C) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 841(b)(1)(C)).

SEC. 3. APPLICATION OF FAIR SENTENCING ACT OF 2010.

Section 404 of the First Step Act of 2018 (21 U.S.C. 841 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking '' 'covered offense' means'' and inserting '' 'covered offense'—

''(1) means'';

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) includes a violation, involving cocaine base, of—

''(A) section 3113 of title 5, United States Code;

''(B) section 401(b)(1)(C) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 841(b)(1)(C));

''(C) section 404(a) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 844(a));

''(D) section 406 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 846);

''(E) section 408 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 848);

''(F) subsection (b) or (c) of section 409 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 849);

''(G) subsection (a) or (b) of section 418 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 859);

''(H) subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 419 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 860);

''(I) section 420 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 861);

''(J) section 1010(b)(3) of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 960(b)(3));

''(K) section 1010A of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 960a);

''(L) section 90103 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12522);

''(M) section 70503 or 70506 of title 46, United States Code; and

''(N) any attempt, conspiracy or solicitation to commit an offense described in subparagraphs (A) through (M).''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by inserting ''A motion under this section that was denied after a court determination that a violation described in subsection (a)(2) was not a covered offense shall not be considered a denial after a complete review of the motion on the merits within the meaning of this section.'' after the period at the end of the second sentence.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. COONS):

S. 1248. A bill to expand eligibility for and provide judicial review for the Elderly Home Detention Pilot Program, and make other technical corrections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1248

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Safer Detention Act of 2023''.

SEC. 2. HOME DETENTION FOR CERTAIN ELDERLY NONVIOLENT OFFENDERS.

Section 231(g) of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (34 U.S.C. 60541(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following:

''(D) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Upon motion of a defendant, on or after the date described in clause (ii), a court may reduce an imposed term of imprisonment of the defendant and substitute a term of supervised release with the condition of home detention for the unserved portion of the original term of imprisonment, after considering the factors set forth in section 3553(a) of title 18, United States Code, if the court finds the defendant is an eligible elderly offender or eligible terminally ill offender.

''(ii) DATE DESCRIBED.—The date described in this clause is the earlier of—

''(I) the date on which the defendant fully exhausts all administrative rights to appeal a failure of the Bureau of Prisons to place the defendant on home detention; or

''(II) the expiration of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the defendant submits to the warden of the facility in which the defendant is imprisoned a request for placement of the defendant on home detention, regardless of the status of the request.''; and

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii)—

(i) by inserting '', including offenses under the laws of the District of Columbia,'' after ''offense or offenses''; and

(ii) by striking ''2/3 of the term of imprisonment to which the offender was sentenced'' and inserting ''1/2 of the term of imprisonment reduced by any credit toward the service of the offender's sentence awarded under section 3624(b) of title 18, United States Code''; and

(B) in subparagraph (D)(i), by inserting '', including offenses under the laws of the District of Columbia,'' after ''offense or offenses''.

SEC. 3. COMPASSIONATE RELEASE TECHNICAL CORRECTION.

Section 3582 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting after ''case'' the following: '', including, notwithstanding any other provision of law, any case involving an offense committed before November 1, 1987''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by inserting '', on or after the date described in subsection (d)'' after ''upon motion of a defendant''; and

(ii) by striking ''after the defendant has fully exhausted all administrative rights to appeal a failure of the Bureau of Prisons to bring a motion on the defendant's behalf or the lapse of 30 days from the receipt of such a request by the warden of the defendant's facility, whichever is earlier,'';

(2) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) DATE DESCRIBED.—For purposes of subsection (c)(1)(A), the date described in this subsection is the earlier of—

''(1) the date on which the defendant fully exhausts all administrative rights to appeal a failure of the Bureau of Prisons to bring a motion on the defendant's behalf; or

''(2) the expiration of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the defendant submits a request for a reduction in sentence to the warden of the facility in which the defendant is imprisoned, regardless of the status of the request.''.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. KING, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VANCE, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1250. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require that direct-to-consumer advertisements for drugs and biologicals include an appropriate disclosure of pricing information; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, most Americans spent more time at home watching television during the pandemic. I know I did. And what was one of the most common commercials we saw? Direct-to-consumer drug ads. You know, those fancy commercials with catchy music, celebrity actors, and swinging golf clubs? Even before COVID, Americans saw an average of nine ads per day. Every year, the pharmaceutical industry spends more than $6 billion on ads—$6 billion. That is the same as the entire budget of the Food and Drug Administration. In fact, we know that most top Pharma companies spend more on their advertising budget than on drug research and development.

It turns out, the United States is one of only two countries in the world that even allows these commercials. Can you guess the other? New Zealand.

Do you want to know why Pharma spends so much money promoting their drugs? Because it increases their profit margins. Pharma pushes these ads because they steer patients to specific, expensive medications—whether a patient actually needs the drugs or not. And sometimes it is easier in a 10-minute meeting for the doctor to just write the prescription than to take the time to explain why the drug may not be needed or a less expensive, generic version might be a better choice. Pharma thinks if they pummel you with enough ads that you finally learn how to spell Xarelto, you will insist to your doctor that this is the blood thinner you need though a less expensive option would be just as effective.

With billions in targeted spending, patients are bombarded with information—don't take Xarelto if you are allergic to Xarelto—but kept in the dark on one crucial factor—the price.

Take Rinvoq, which is manufactured by Illinois-based AbbVie for eczema and arthritis. It is now the most-advertised drug on television—replacing two other AbbVie medications, Humira and Skyrizi. AbbVie spent $315 million last year on TV ads for Rinvoq alone. But nowhere in the ad do they tell you it costs $6,100 per month.

Well, Senator GRASSLEY and I think it is time for Big Pharma to end the secrecy. If they are advertising a drug, they should disclose the price right up front. It is a basic transparency measure for patients. Consumer protection 101. So today, we are reintroducing bipartisan legislation to require price disclosures in direct-to-consumer drugs ads, or DTC ads. Our plan is simple, and it has actually passed the Senate once before.

Here is why we think this transparency in drug ads is so important. Earlier this year, a study found that more than two-thirds of drugs advertised on television were considered, quote, ''low-value.'' Those pricey drugs that show you whitewater rafting or rock climbing? They are often no better than other, more affordable drugs.

One-in-five Americans do not take their medications as prescribed because of the cost. They cut their pills in half or skip doses because they can't afford to take their medications as prescribed. So don't you think it is worth knowing right away that Rinvoq could run you $6,100 per month rather than waiting for that moment of truth at the pharmacy counter?

Don't just take my word for it. These advertisements often urge you to ''ask your doctor if it is right for you.'' Well, we asked those doctors. The American Medical Association says: ''Direct-to-consumer advertising inflates demand for new and expensive drugs, even when these drugs may not be appropriate.''

As Democrats are working in Washington to avoid default and prevent our economy from crashing and to preserve the solvency of Medicare, we asked the Government Accountability Office, GAO, to look at the impact of these DTC ads on Medicare's budget. The GAO found that between 2016 and 2018, drugs advertised on television accounted for 58 percent of Medicare's spending. These DTC ads ballooned Medicare spending on a small handful of drugs, costing the Medicare Program $320 billion over 3 years. Humira topped the list with $500 million in advertising in 2018, which contributed to $2.4 billion in Medicare costs.

I used this chart in 2017 when I first introduced this legislation, and when the monthly cost of Humira was $3,700 per month. But as you can see, the cost of Humira is now $6,900 per month. Shouldn't AbbVie—makers of Humira—disclose that price to you so you can use this information when making treatment decisions? If they did, AbbVie may think twice before raising the price.

Our DTC bill is supported by Democrats and Republicans, the AARP, American Medical Association, American Hospital Association, and 88 percent of Americans. President Trump supported our bill. This bill has passed the Senate before. And several Republicans have included this provision in larger packages they have supported. The only opposition comes from one place: Pharma. They hate the idea of being honest with patients about the price of their drugs and they are looking for Senators to help keep their secret.

So when the Senate considers drug pricing legislation in the coming weeks, I will ask for a vote on this bipartisan policy. Senator GRASSLEY has been a great partner in this effort; and we will work to bring this dose of sunshine to the airwaves. It is about time Americans catch a break when it comes to the cost of drugs.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1250

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Drug-Price Transparency for Consumers Act of 2023'' or the ''DTC Act of 2023''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF THE SENATE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Direct-to-consumer advertising of prescription pharmaceuticals is legally permitted in only 2 developed countries, the United States and New Zealand.

(2) In 2018, pharmaceutical ad spending exceeded $6,046,000,000, a 4.8 percent increase over 2017, resulting in the average American seeing 9 drug advertisements per day.

(3) The most commonly advertised medication in the United States in 2020 had a list price of more than $6,000 for a one-month's supply.

(4) A 2021 Government Accountability Office report found that two-thirds of all direct-to-consumer drug advertising between 2016 and 2018 was concentrated among 39 brand-name drugs or biologicals, about half of which were recently approved by the Food and Drug Administration.

(5) According to a 2011 Congressional Budget Office report, pharmaceutical manufacturers advertise their products directly to consumers in an attempt to boost demand for their products and thereby raise the price that consumers are willing to pay, increase the quantity of drugs sold, or achieve some combination of the two.

(6) Studies, including a 2012 systematic review published in the Annual Review of Public Health, a 2005 randomized trial published